

09



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,443	12/28/2001	Surendra Kumar Rajak	1330.1107	4421
21171	7590	12/02/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			LE, DEBBIE M	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2168	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/8/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Owens et al (US patent 6,529,915 B1).

As per claim 1, Owens discloses a method for use with an object model which stores in a database (Fig. 3, #103), the method comprising:

automatically extracting the data from the database by directly extracting the data from the object model using an object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 2, lines 28-30, col. 12, lines 26-30).

automatically translating the extracted data to a non-object format (Fig. 13, col. 12, lines 26-30).

As per claim 2, Owens discloses a method for use with an object model which stores in a database (Fig. 3, # 103), the method comprising:

automatically extracting the data from the database by directly extracting the data from the object model using an object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 2, lines 28-30, col. 12, lines 26-30); and

automatically building a non-object database from the extracted data (col. 3, lines 25-29).

As per claim 3, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29).

As per claim 5, Owens wherein said automatically building builds the non-object database using a query language corresponding to the non-object database (Fig. 13, # 605-611, col. 9, lines 14-19) and which is different from the object query language corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 12, lines 51-52).

As per claim 6, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29).

As per claim 7, Owens teaches wherein the non-object database is a relational database (col. 3, lines 28-29) and the query language corresponding to the non-object database is SQL (col. 12, lines 1-25).

Claims 19-21 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claims 1 and 2 arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al (US patent 6,529,915 B1) in view of Shen (US Patent 5,937,410).

As per claim 8, Owens teaches a method comprising:

Selecting object-oriented data in an object model by a user (col. 6, lines 6-33),
the selected data being stored in a database by the object model (Fig. 3, # 103);

automatically extracting the selected data from the database by directly
extracting the selected data from the object model using an object query language
corresponding to the object model (Fig. 13, # 601, col. 12, lines 26-30); and

automatically building tables for the extracted data in accordance with metadata
for the extracted data, the tables being tables for a target relational database (Fig. 13, #
605-611, col. 9, lines 14-19).

Owens does not explicitly teach automatically inserting the extracted data into
the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and which is different
from the object query language. However, Shen teaches automatically inserting the
extracted data into the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and
which is different from the object query language (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 18-20). Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to automatically inserting the extracted data into the tables using a query language corresponding to the tables and which is different from the object query language as taught by Shen because it would provide users of Owens's system to enhancing the usefulness of the transformation with further design options, such as efficiency querying the data in a manner of joining more than one tables to obtain the data in order to meet the programmer requirements.

As per claim 9, Owens teaches automatically loading the tables with the inserted data into the target relational database (col. 9, lines 56-60).

As per claim 10, Owens teaches automatically generating queries in the object query language corresponding to the object model, for extracting the selected data (Fig. 13, # performing a query).

Claims 11, 13, 16, 17 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 8 arguments.

Claims 12, 14 have the same limitation as claim 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Claims 15 have the same limitation as claim 10; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

As per claim 18, Owens teaches wherein the selection device is one of the group consisting of a graphical user interface and a control table (col. 6, lines 19-33).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY GAFFIN can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

Debbie Le

Nov. 24, 2005.